THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. V NOVEMBER, 1922 No. 29

EDITORIAL

REUNION, ETC.

Lord Halifax's book, *A Call to Reunion*,* following, as it does, so close upon the recognition of our Orders by the Synod of Constantinople, reminds us that the vision which illuminated the Lambeth Conference of 1920 is one that does not tarry. It besets us and claims our attention, and haunts our prayers. Here is Cardinal Mercier's Pastoral Letter to his diocese of Malines, with its description of the election of the present Pope, introduced to English readers by a layman of the English Church; and we cannot read it without emotion. Here, too, is an English Churchman witnessing to his own life-long loyalty to our Anglican ways, and combining this witness with a plea, full of the spirit of lofty and judicious charity, for a fresh effort to overcome the barriers which divide us from Rome; and we are bound to consider it seriously. The very reality of the contact which exists makes it possible and seemly that we should submit our situation to careful and exacting scrutiny.

The issues between Roman and Anglican ideals fall naturally into three groups, of which only the first two are discussed at all fully in this book. They are (1) doctrinal, (2) ecclesiastical, (3) moral and political. We do not propose here to say much about the third, except in so far as it arises out of the second; but the article printed below from Mr. Hoskyns's pen is only one of many reminders that those issues are very grave. Contemporary experience seems to endorse the judgment passed by historians such as Lord Acton and others that there are many elements of social duty which the Roman system seems very weak in inculcating, and that the ethics of ordered liberty, which are so marked a feature of our highest traditions, are ill provided for in Roman life and thought. Much that has passed

* Mowbray and Co. 2s. net.

for history in our textbooks needs to be rewritten or corrected in the interests of truth; but the broad fact that the authority of the Roman Church has been used almost invariably to uphold despotisms and to thwart liberties stands as unassailable as ever. Liberal and humane causes have rarely owed much to the sympathy of Rome; they have constantly had to beat down its obdurate hostility.

On matters of doctrine there is naturally a wide area of common ground between us. In a particularly interesting passage of the Memorandum which Lord Halifax submitted for discussion with the Cardinal, he says:

"In regard to the truths of revelation and all dogmatic statements it is also necessary to bear in mind, in view of the infinite nature of the matter treated and the limited capacity of the human mind and of human language, that all theological definitions are necessarily only approximate statements, and cannot claim to be complete and absolute expositions of the truths in question. . . . If that is so, then room can legitimately be made for some divergence of opinion even upon what might seem to be important matters."

Cardinal Mercier does not seem to have taken exception to this statement; and it is unquestionably vital to the Anglican position. What it means is that, while Catholic dogma is binding, it is not necessarily a final or complete statement of the truth. We are bound, that is, to accept Catholic dogma as far as it goes; but we are not bound to hold that it goes the whole way, or that new experience of the Spirit may not lead the Church to fresh insight and ampler definition. We seem pointed to a conception of doctrinal authority which will reconcile many elements in modern thought at present estranged from the Faith.

In the discussion of Lord Halifax's Memorandum, the question arose as to the possibility of distinguishing between primary and secondary elements in doctrine; and as expressing the Anglican view of what was fundamental he referred to a fourfold standard which may well prove of great service in future, viz.:

1. The Creeds as recited by all.
2. The Catechism as necessary for Confirmation.
3. The Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the Catholic doctors and fathers.
4. And generally what was prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer as giving effect to the principle *lex orandi lex credendi.*

It is to be noted that the reference is not only to formularies, but to the current practice of which they form part; and the point gives an actuality to the whole discussion which we so often miss when negotiating with Nonconformists.

The Cardinal's answer on this point is not given, though we may surmise that the transition to the subject of the Papal claims is not accidental; much could be done, perhaps, if they were accepted. On our side, however, the matter cannot quite be left there. We are very near the heart of Anglican principles at this point, and it needs to be explicitly stressed. We do distinguish—and we regard the distinction as vital—between primary and secondary doctrines. We regard as primary, *i.e.*, *de fide*, only those dogmas which rest on the free consensus of the whole Catholic Church, East and West, and have clear warrant in Holy Scripture. Roman theologians would probably agree to this principle in theory; but it is impossible to see how such a dogma as that of the Immaculate Conception can be conformed to it. A wide gulf still yawns between the Roman canons of biblical exegesis and our own; and the objective standards of scholarship familiar to us in Anglican theology are one of our chief contributions to a reunited Christendom. The difference is that between the habit of mind which says that a thing is true because the Church teaches it, and one which says that the Church teaches a thing because it is true.

On the Roman side Cardinal Mercier lays especial stress on the Papal claims.

"The question (says Lord Halifax) directly raised by Cardinal Mercier's Pastoral, and to which he wished attention to be drawn, is that of the necessity of a visible centre in the interests of the Church's unity, and of the fact that our Lord provided for such a centre in the person of St. Peter and his successors."*

The passage recalls the language of St. Cyprian in commenting on the Petrine text. We do not think that Anglicans will object to it; and, indeed, it ought to be far more in our minds than it is. The primacy of St. Peter among the Apostles seems to have been a distinct part of our Lord's intention; and, though there is no evidence of His extension of it to successors, it is reasonable to suppose that it embodied a principle —the principle of centring the Church's outward unity in a single visible leader—which is of permanent application. That is a fair deduction from the evidence of the Gospels.

At the same time, it is equally clear from the Acts and the Epistles that this primacy was not conceived of as a supremacy.

* P. 12.

The principle of primacy is capable of being worked out in practice on many different lines, and there would be room for plenty of adjustment here. But the claim to universal jurisdiction is in another category. Cardinal Mercier's Pastoral letter leaves us in no doubt as to what it means, when he writes:

"Blessed be our Holy Father the Pope, in whom this authority is centred, *and from whom it flows*,* through all branches of the hierarchy, in order to spread its benefits on the faithful and on the world."

And again:

"The Pope receives no sacramental character, his office is that of the Bishop, in whom it is realized in its fullness. But the Pope receives from the Holy Ghost a power of jurisdiction, the investiture of an authority which extends to the whole world, and is exercised, in a direct and immediate manner, on every particular church, on every priest, on all the faithful of Christendom.

That is the claim of one who inherits from the Roman principate rather than from the Petrine commission.

The solution of the problem of Reunion would seem to turn, then, on whether Rome will so restate its doctrine of jurisdiction as to make the Papal position really a primacy and not a supremacy. It cannot be easy for those who inherit a purely Latin tradition to come to terms with those whose thought in constitutional matters derives rather from Greek or Anglo-Saxon sources. Such barriers can only be overcome by the grace of the Holy Spirit and a scrupulous fidelity to the Scriptures He has inspired. But it would be to betray a great ignorance of Church History to suppose that the change of policy so involved is impossible, or even without parallel in Roman annals. Probably no Pope has ever had so fair a field for the enterprise as the present occupant of the Holy See.

Meanwhile, the Church of England also has a duty to perform within her own borders; it is to become explicit to herself. Our readers will remember the earnest plea we urged over eighteen months ago for the appointment of a Doctrinal Commission;† and we are interested to note that this plea has awakened a cautious, but distinct, echo in our American contemporary, *The Anglican Theological Review*.‡ We urged its appointment in the interests, partly of apologetic, partly of Reunion, and partly of our own spiritual interests at home. Lord Halifax's book is one reminder of the need: the

* Italics ours.—Ed. † Theology, II., 111 *ff*.
‡ March, 1922 : Note by T. B. Foster.

imminence of Prayer-Book Revision is another. Indeed it is possibly this last which will be found to necessitate the step.

Prayer-Book Revision is far more closely connected with Reunion both at home and abroad than is commonly recognised. In the first place, the Lambeth Appeal for Reunion, addressed as it was to Rome and the East, as well as to Protestants, kindled in the minds of large numbers of Church people a sense of their already existing solidarity with Catholic Christianity abroad and a desire to express it more plainly. That desire has played a large part in encouraging conformity in external and "indifferent" matters to Roman models; and it is partly to meet the situation so created that the revision of the Prayer-Book is so necessary. In the second place, any real integration of Nonconformity with the life of the Church will involve, supposing that the questions of principle have been settled, considerable modification of the Act of Uniformity. The advice once given by a Lutheran divine to Burnet is probably still true: "Let the Church of England heal her own breaches, and then all the rest of the reformed Churches will, with great respect, admit of her mediation to heal theirs."*

There seems a general agreement, among its enemies no less than its friends, that the Anglo-Catholic movement has become, and bids fair to remain, the most live factor in English Church life; and we may well consider first the effect of that position on the whole problem. The immediate danger seems to us to be that enthusiasm for the Catholic movement may take the place of belief in the Catholic Church. The devotional and pastoral elements of religion have been developed in the movement so rapidly and so successfully that constructive statesmanship, and to some extent theological thought, have been unable to keep pace with it. The result has been a steady increase of individualism among the clergy, and a growing spirit of unrest among the laity. Both tendencies are weakening to the Church as a whole. It is vital that the clergy on their side should recover the Catholic sense of canonical obligation; and the laity have a right to ask that the principles and limits of toleration within the Church of England shall be defined. In other words, what is needed is to stabilize matters on an intelligible and ordered basis.

Two contributions towards this end deserve to be mentioned. The first is contained in the Bishop of Durham's Upsala lectures

* Quoted in Bishop Hemon's *Anglicanism*, p. 54. Macmillan and Co., 1921.

published in 1921 under the title *Anglicanism*. Briefly, his policy may be defined as the suppression of the Anglo-Catholic movement in the interests of a National and Protestant institution. A sombre note of despair seems to run through the lectures suggesting that the Bishop does not see how it is to be done. Nor, indeed, do we. Nothing, indeed, can be done except by a sympathetic recognition of real spiritual forces as being what they are.

More hopeful, because more constructive, are some proposals outlined by Bishop Knox in a recent lecture at the Church House. We quote from the report in *The Times* of October 4, 1922:

"After criticizing the report in detail, Dr. Knox asked what practical action was it possible to take at this stage of Church revision? The answers to that were: (1) The measure on Prayer-Book revision should have passed through Parliament concurrently with it a measure (*a*) giving to the laity of the parish the right to inquire of a minister before he was appointed in what manner he proposed to conduct the services, and if his answers were unsatisfactory, to present to the Bishop a complaint to that effect, and such complaint should be accepted by the Bishop as a ground for refusing institution; (*b*) that a clergyman departing from his promises to the congregation should, after sufficient warning, if he continued in such departure, be deprived of his benefice; (*c*) that laity dissatisfied with the options accepted should have the right of forming a congregation, and, on giving security for his maintenance to the Bishop, of appointing a clergyman of their own, with full powers. (Cheers.)

(2) "Before entering on the details of revision a reference should be sent to the Convocations, asking them to produce a report showing what were the principles which they had observed in their proposed alterations of the law regulating public worship, and on which they had sanctioned ornaments, rites, and ceremonies at present inconsistent with the laws of the Church of England respecting the same. (Hear, hear.)"

Other proposals follow, but these are the important ones.

The second of these proposals need not present difficulty, and would, in our judgment, be advantageous, though it could not be carried out without the work of some such Commission as we have already advocated. In the first proposal, sections (*a*) and (*b*) are unacceptable, as substituting Parochialism for Episcopacy in the government of the Church, and the individualism of the parish for that of the priest. But the third section contains a suggestion which, in a modified form, might be of great value. It amounts to the right to "contract out" of the general system of public worship which may emerge from Prayer-Book Revision. Obviously, such a method is capable of application in more than one direction. It may prove to be a necessity if order and peace are to be secured.

The National Assembly will resume this month the discussion of Prayer-Book Revision. The Report has now been "received," and a measure based on it will probably be introduced by the Bishops, and submitted to the other two houses of the Assembly separately. Interest centres mainly in the Liturgy. Both in this Journal and in the Assembly we have supported in the main the present proposals, and we shall continue to do so; for we believe them to represent a solid improvement for which the great bulk both of clergy and laity are ready, and which they desire.

At the same time it seems clear that these proposals will not meet all sides of the problem. There are many churches where existing usage has gone for some time past on different lines, much closer to the 1549 model, with borrowings from other sources, both ancient and modern. We hope and believe that the National Assembly will be prepared to make further provision to meet this situation. We speak deliberately of *further* provision. It is most improbable that an attempt to amend the existing proposals in a 1549 direction would be successful except in unimportant details. On the other hand, if an additional alternative liturgy were put forward as embodying the practice and the wishes of a considerable body of clergy and its permissive use asked for in the interests of order and peace, the National Assembly would be bound to consider it seriously. Certain conditions might be insisted on; as, for instance, that it should not be introduced for the first time in a parish without the Bishop's sanction, such sanction to be governed by canon. But the rite itself would be a recognized one in the Church of England, and those who were dissatisfied with the existing proposals could be rightly required to conform to it.

The result, then, would be the permissive use of three forms of Eucharistic worship—viz.:

(*a*) The existing Prayer-Book liturgy, which will still command the love of large numbers.

(*b*) The revised Form as already received by the National Assembly.

(*c*) An additional alternative Form, intended to meet the wishes of an important and devoted section of clergy.

The fact that the National Assembly Committee's Report advocates a similar threefold solution in the case of the Baptismal Office makes it reasonable that they should do so in this case too.

We believe that the problem is not insoluble if the positive principles for which each side to the controversy is contending are understood. Evangelicals are perfectly justified in insisting that the spiritual status of the laity shall be recognised; that change in the order of public worship shall be such as commends itself to their conscience and intelligence; and that they shall be regarded as partners in every service. Anglo-Catholics are equally justified in claiming that pastoral and doctrinal methods which have amply proved their value and efficiency in the life of the Church shall be given due scope in any reconstruction now made. The embodiment of these principles in a revised Prayer-Book is not easy, and any attempt to secure a hard-and-fast uniformity is doomed to failure. But if the lines can be laid down on which present abuses can be outgrown, much will have been accomplished. In the first place, clergy and laity of the Church of England would know where they stood; and the energy which has spent itself in restless controversy could be devoted to the more thorough exercise of pastoral duty. On the basis of a canonical and statutary system, comprehensive but not vague, the Bishops could call their clergy together to a renewal of vows and a fresh dedication to their priesthood. In the second place, the recovery of Catholic order and discipline would clear the air for negotiation towards Reunion. Towards Rome we should exhibit an impressive picture of a form of jurisdiction which was definite without regimentation and embraced the laity as well as the clergy. And to Nonconformists we should show that the order and dignity of our Catholic heritage is compatible with a large elasticity, and that there is no positive spiritual principle contended for in their history which has not ample place provided for it in the English Church.

CATHOLICISM IN GERMANY

It may perhaps be not inopportune to draw the attention of the readers of THEOLOGY to two Catholic movements in Germany, which seem to be of more than local importance.

Since the War it has not been clear whether the Centrum, the Catholic party in the Reichstag, should lend its whole-hearted support to the present Government or not. This uncertainty has been due to a lack of clearness among the South German Catholics as to what their attitude should be to a Government based upon a revolution. This state of affairs seems now to have come to an end, with the authoritative declaration that Catholicism in Germany is both national and reactionary.

The German Catholic Congress was held this year in Munich during the week beginning Sunday, August 27, and was attended by representatives from every part of Germany. The enthusiasm of the Congress was, however, provided by the thousands of Bavarian peasants who, with their parish priests, came to Munich by special trains to be present at the Mass which was to be said in the Königsplatz, and to hear the address of the Archbishop of Munich (Cardinal von Faulhaber). Some thirty processions were formed and marched to the Königsplatz early on the Sunday morning, and by 11 o'clock the number in the square was estimated at 90,000 when the Cardinal took up his position in the pulpit. "He stood," said the *Münchener Zeitung*, "as the personified power of the Catholic Church." But he stood also as a German nationalist, who before the War had been professor in the Catholic faculty of the University of Strasbourg, and was one of the professors imposed upon the Alsatian University by the German Government.

To the outsider it was perfectly clear that a very great responsibility rested on the Cardinal. Whatever he said would be regarded as an authoritative statement of the duty of German Catholics at a time when political and national feeling was very deeply stirred. France and England were, at the moment, sharply divided, and the Paris Conference had broken up without arriving at any agreement. The mark had fallen during the preceding fortnight to a quarter its former value, and prices were rising with alarming rapidity. Behind the scenes in Munich a suppressed but passionate hatred of France demanded some expression, which tended to take shape in attacks on the German Government, which was supposed to be carrying out the Treaty of Versailles to the best of its ability. Ten days before Hindenburg and Ludendorf appeared in Munich,

in full uniform, and the old national and military emotions had been passionately excited. This was the background when the Cardinal stood up to address 90,000 German Catholics. He chose as the subject of his address, "Catholic truth and the duty of Catholics." The most important paragraph of his speech deserves to be quoted verbatim. "The Revolution," he said, "was an act of perjury and treason. It stands in history branded with the mark of Cain. Even if such an act had, with its evil, brought any advantage to Germany, it could never be regarded as in any sense holy." The significance of these words was increased by the fact that by the side of the Cardinal stood Rupprecht, the heir to the throne, and his wife, and other members of the Bavarian royal house, who were received with great enthusiasm. The *Münchener Zeitung* commented: "The Cardinal's strong and clear statement will ring in the ears of many who did not themselves hear it." After the Cardinal's address the Papal nuncio said Mass, and the assembly was dismissed.

The reports of the evening meeting, when the delegates were officially received, show as clearly as the Cardinal's address the real meaning of the Conference. The chairman of the local committee was greeted with great applause when he said, "We are not only Catholics, we are also Germans; Hoch, Deutschland." The president of the Congress, after describing the position of Germans in the occupied area, reminded the delegates that they stood for the "unity of the German Empire." He was followed by Graf Lerchenfeld, the Bavarian Minister President, who said: "For centuries the Catholic view of life has formed the background of Bavarian civilization"; he described the glory of the country under the wise leadership of the Bavarian royal house (loud applause): "It is the aim of the Catholic Congress to show the greatness of the Catholic view of life; and all must work for the perfection of the Catholic mode of life, which is the basis of true Christian politics. We German Catholics must be the best and most perfect Germans."

The importance of the Congress was generally held to lie in the fact that Catholic authority definitely appealed to German Catholics to think of Catholicism in national terms, and to link this national Catholicism with the hope of the return of the monarchy, at any rate in Bavaria. Hence the peculiar popularity of the Tyrolese procession. To quote again the *Münchener Zeitung*: "This procession was not only an expression of loyalty to the faith of their fathers, it was a silent despairing appeal, 'Let us not be destroyed, you brothers of ours, in the German Empire; we long for you, you are our hope, our last hope.' To-day, it is not one man who lies in shackles, it is a

whole people. In a few days the Tyrolese will hold their breath, while the fate of millions of German brothers will be decided. Life or death." This last sentence referred to the decision about to be made by the League of Nations as to whether the Tyrol should or should not form part of Bavaria.

It seems therefore, that, at a time when the peace of Europe depends on the strengthening of those elements in our civilization which are not merely national, German Roman Catholicism is becoming increasingly the expression of violent and uncritical nationalism. On the other hand, the Lutheran Church shows signs of breaking away from its national tradition, and is looking towards Catholic Christianity for a wider expression of Christian experience. It is to this Catholic movement within Lutheranism that I wish, by way of contrast, to draw the attention of your readers.

The whole fabric of German Lutheranism was shaken to its foundations by the Revolution; for Lutheran piety was a national Christian piety, and the Kaiser was far more than the head of the State; he was Summus Episcopus of the Protestant Church, and, as such, he was not merely the head of an organization, he formed part of Lutheran piety. "Thron und altar" expressed this double aspect of German Lutheranism. The Revolution left the Lutherans with a feeling of homelessness, and many looked across to Catholicism with a sense of jealousy. Catholic piety was not nationally limited; its organization was independent of the old régime; and, whereas Lutheranism was stunned by the collapse of Germany, Catholicism seemed stronger than before, and its worship possessed a power which was absent in the Lutheran Churches. This was the background on which the Catholic movement within German Lutheranism made its appearance.

In the autumn of 1918 six pastors met in Berlin to form the "Hochkirchliche Vereinigung" (High Church Union). They met primarily as Evangelical Lutherans, but they met also as men who recognized that Catholicism possesses religious powers which are not found in Protestant Churches, or which are found only in a very rudimentary form. They set themselves the task of working towards a synthesis of Protestantism and Catholicism. They desired an Evangelical Catholicism independent of State control and of Rome—"A Church which is at once Evangelical and Catholic, Christian and universal; a Church whose soul is Evangelical and whose body is Catholic."

At the conclusion of the meeting the objects of the union were formulated as follows:

(1) To reform Lutheran worship in such a way that the Sacraments, and particularly the Eucharist, might receive greater emphasis.

(2) To develop within German Protestantism an Evangelical monasticism.

(3) To stimulate among Lutherans a sense of the Church as the visible organ of salvation, founded by Christ and His Apostles.

The movement which had its origin in this meeting of six pastors is now a force to be reckoned with in modern Lutheranism. It has founded a monthly journal, *Die Hochkirche. Monatsschrift der Hochkirchlichen Vereinigung*, published by K. J. Müller, Berlin; and it has a central office in Heckelberg, in the province of Brandenburg.

This nascent Catholicism is, however, not merely the work of a relatively small number of pastorally-minded Lutheran ministers. Behind them stands a small group of professors at the University of Marburg, whose writings guide and control the movement, and give it a vigorous intellectual background.

In 1917 Rudolf Otto, Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in Marburg, published a book with the title *Holiness* (*Das Heilige*), which has now reached its eighth edition. In it he protests against the tyranny of rationalism in orthodox as well as in liberal theology, and his book is a study of the relation between the intellectual and non-intellectual bases of religious experience. He points out that holiness involves more than goodness, and is the outcome of something deeper than a rational belief in God. This further element, which he calls "das numinöse," and which he attempts to analyze, is the subject of his book. The sense of awe in the presence of the supernatural and the consciousness of sharing in the supernatural are, he says, essential to holiness, and in reinterpreting the New Testament writings in the light of this wider conception of holiness, he emphasizes the Gospel of Jesus as far more than the proclamation of the fatherhood of God. The kingdom is fundamental to the Gospel of Jesus, and the kingdom of God is a miraculous supernatural kingdom which is from heaven. The Gospel of Jesus was thus, from the beginning, the Gospel of Salvation and Redemption; it did not gradually become so. Rudolf Otto sees in this sharing in the supernatural, or, as he would say, in this "divinization," the essence of Christianity. He refuses to allow his book to be merely the study of religion by a philosopher detached from any experience of its power; and he discourages those who have no experience of religious awe from reading his book; equally, he refuses to study primitive Christianity as though it were an interesting phase of human history. He demands Christianity to-day to proclaim itself as the religion of salvation, and to escape from the rationalism and the moralism with which its Gospel is being stifled.

It is easy to see why such a book stimulates and supports those men who are struggling to introduce into Lutheran worship the sense of religious awe, and who are beginning to rediscover the mystical conception of the Church as the kingdom of God upon earth.

Closely allied with Rudolf Otto is Friedrich Heiler, Professor of the History of Comparative Religion at Marburg. He is more clearly and definitely the intellectual force behind the movement. The titles of his books are in themselves significant. Six lectures, which he gave in Sweden, bear the title, *The Essence of Catholicism*. His other works are: *The Importance of Mysticism in Religion*, *The Significance of Luther in the History of Religion*, *Contemplation in Buddhism*, and *The Cult of the Madonna*. His most important work, however, is entitled *Prayer, A Historical and Psychological Study* (published by Ernst Reinhardt, Munich, 1st edition 1918, 4th edition 1921). In addition, he is the editor of a series of studies under the general title of *From the World of Christian Piety*, of which only two volumes have as yet appeared: *Catholic and Evangelical Worship*, by the editor, and *The Religious Power of Catholic Dogma*, by Dr. Fendt. Professor Heiler has most clearly formulated the idea of an Evangelical Catholicism, and has given the movement the authority of his name.

The combination within the movement of intellectual vigour with a very highly developed sense of pastoral responsibility would seem to suggest that it has a future before it. But the point I am concerned to emphasize is that in it Lutheranism is seeking to escape from nationalism in religion, and seems to be moving in an exactly opposite direction to German Roman Catholicism. Already they have a fairly close connection with somewhat similar movements in Sweden, and with great diffidence they are looking towards Anglicanism. Here they are compelled to move with care, for they have been attacked for choosing a name for their union which sounds in itself English. (The "High Church" is the usual name in Germany for the English Church, and not for a particular section of it.)

In the present situation it is difficult to see how they can make any advance towards us; on the other hand, they would welcome any expression of sympathy which we might give them. We possess a long experience of non-Roman Catholicism, particularly on the pastoral side, which would be most valuable to them. They possess an intellectual vigour which shows signs of evolving a constructive and liberal Catholic theology, which we very urgently need. We possess a strongly developed sense of historic Christianity as a growing and developing organism,

and are therefore in a position to save them from producing merely a piety with a Catholic tinge, but in no organic connection with historic Christianity. They, if they have really recaptured something of the old German Evangelicalism, possess a devotion which may reinforce the Evangelical basis of Catholicism within the Anglican Church.

E. C. Hoskyns.

THE CRITICAL WORK OF JOHANNES WEISS

(II.)

In Johannes Weiss' analysis of St. Mark (*Das älteste Evangelium*) a cardinal place is occupied by the theory that the Evangelist was deeply concerned with the problem of the Jewish rejection of Jesus. St. Mark solves that problem, according to Weiss, by throwing the Pauline solution of it into narrative form—*i.e.*, by shaping his narrative so as to suggest that the unbelief of the Jew was the result of a Divine judgment, a penal hardening of the Jewish heart.

I propose to offer here a criticism of this conception; and in order to do this, it will be necessary to give some indication of the place which it holds in Weiss' critical dissection of the New Testament literature.

Weiss points out that the extant fragments of the Gospel of Peter, together with the Epistle of Barnabas, form the last member of a series of documents in which the breach between the old Israel and the new is progressively conceived as more and more final and profound. At the end of this series we find the utmost possible insistence upon Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion, together with the strongest possible claim that the Old Testament is from end to end a Christian and, indeed, an anti-Jewish book. A little further back comes the Fourth Gospel. Here the declaration that "salvation is of the Jews" stands in tragic contrast to the judgment which is so constantly passed upon the Jewish people; they *cannot* believe, they cannot hear the word of Jesus; "they are at every point the typical representatives of the *cosmos*, void of belief and hostile to God." Not far distant from this is the condemnation expressed in 1 Peter, "They stumble at the rock of offence, refusing obedience to the word—whereunto they were also appointed." In the two volumes of the Lucan history, we find a clear expression of the conviction that salvation has passed away from the Jew to become the heritage of the Gentile. The spirit of the scene of Luke iv., in which Jesus finds no acceptance in His own city,

and is forced to justify from prophetic history His refusal to do wonders there, is reproduced throughout the Acts. Through their persecution of the disciples, and particularly through the murder of Stephen, the Jews themselves forced the Gospel mission to devote itself to the pagan world; in the Dispersion they repudiated the Word of God time after time, judging themselves unworthy of eternal life; finally, through their persecution of St. Paul they became the cause of the extension of his Gospel to Rome itself.

St. Matthew's Gospel, on the other hand, coming as it does, in Weiss' judgment, from a Church not far removed from that which gave birth to the homily known as the Epistle of James, exhibits a more complex type of the Christian attitude to Judaism. Like the Epistle of James, it is strongly tinged with legalism: it asserts the inviolable sanctity of that law which Jesus fulfilled and—as the Second Moses—promulgated from the Mount. Even though this sanctity attaches chiefly to ethical precepts, it also demands fidelity to literal observance, to the tithing of mint, anise and cummin, and to the following of the injunctions of Pharisee and scribe. The legalist who writes thus is both tender and stern to his own people. Though Jesus came to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and restricted the first mission of His apostles to Israel alone, yet it is the Jews themselves who are responsible for the tragedy of the chosen race. The casting out of the sons of the kingdom and the giving of the kingdom to another people are not, as in the latest documents, the result of an inevitable decree: they result from that deep spirit of unbelief which has always killed the prophets, and which utters itself most completely in the cry "His blood be on us and on our children!" Hence the first sending of the twelve to the cities of Israel is counterbalanced and outweighed in the end by their mission to all the Gentiles.

Similar as Matthew is in spirit to St. Paul the Hebrew, yet there is no direct contact between him and Paulinism. Indirect contact there is, in so far as he inherits the Pauline Gospel as one of his sources; yet he remains essentially anti-Pauline, and the form in which he presents the tragedy of Judaism owes nothing to the dogmatic teaching of St. Paul.*

We come now to St. Mark, *das älteste Evangelium:* the oldest Gospel, not in the sense that in its present shape it represents with any degree of purity the primitive tradition, nor that it represents the earliest form of Gospel narrative which

* Weiss was inclined, though not without misgivings, to assign the origin of Matthew, with its insistence upon the primacy of Peter, to Antioch, the scene of an early discomfiture of St. Paul and also for many years the scene of St. Peter's activity.

analysis can rediscover, but merely in the sense that it is, for the most part, chronologically prior to the other three. We must not then treat St. Mark as a fountain-head, but as a point at which several streams from higher levels have joined their waters, to form a tarn which will send down its contents to be joined by other water-courses in the valleys below; *Markus ist nicht Quelle, sondern Sammelbecken.* Weiss' criticism of St. Mark employs two main factors. He held that it was possible, first, to separate the work of the redactor from that Ur-Markus which was used by the other Synoptists, and next to analyze out Mark's own editorial modifications of his material, and so to discover the form and content of the tradition as it came into his hands.

As for the redactor, Weiss believed him to have retouched the Marcan portrait throughout, sharpening the details and throwing into relief every feature that could emphasize the spiritual intensity and overpowering force of the central Figure. In these added touches, the emotional energy and the emotional effect of the activity of Jesus are brought into vivid prominence; His exaltation, indignation, pity, astonishment, tenderness; over against these, the amazement and fear of the multitude, and above all the excitement with which they press upon Him in crowds—all of which is either absent in the parallels, or markedly lower in tone.

As for Mark's relation to his sources, Weiss' attitude was marked by a vigorous reaction against the strongly sceptical method and negative results of Wrede. He agreed indeed with Wrede that to Mark questions of historical order were of little or no consequence, and that he was not well enough acquainted with Palestinian geography to give a coherent account of the movements of Jesus. On the other hand, he set a high value upon the sources used by Mark—namely, Q and the Petrine tradition*—and believed Mark to have used them with some fidelity and discretion. In his handling of this material, Mark was not, as Baur imagined him to be, a featureless neutral; neither was he a mechanical pedantic follower of St. Paul, nor a doctrinal teacher who used invented narrative as his vehicle. The stories which he tells have, like those of the Fourth Gospel, a typical and universal element, but the value for him depends upon the fact that they are true history; the subjective element is kept within strict limits—not the narrator, but the Gospel, stands in the foreground.

* Weiss accepted the tradition recorded by Papias, which connects Mark with the reminiscences and mission preaching of St. Peter. He held that this Petrine matter existed, in a form and substance relatively fixed, before the writing of Mark, and much of its content, order, and connection can be recovered from Mark, who used it almost unchanged at the beginning of the Gospel, but handled the later part, especially the episode of Cæsarea Philippi and its sequels, with great freedom.

What, then, is the subjective colouring given by the Evangelist? He has, from the beginning, a purpose beyond that of preaching Jesus as the Son of God. As the Fourth Gospel is intended, not to prove the Divine Sonship, but to show how the Word become flesh was rejected by the many and accepted by the few, so also Mark reveals to his readers how the Son of God was revealed to the disciples alone, and was unacknowledged and rejected by the Jewish people. He brings this vividly before the reader; he shows that it could not have happened otherwise. It is thus that he supplies the answer to a question which must have pressed heavily upon the minds of Gentile and Jew alike, a question which must again and again have been encountered in the work of mission preaching—if Jesus was the Son of God, how comes it that the Jews of His own day, among whom He worked such wonders, fail to receive Him? The pressure of this question was felt deeply by St. Paul. He solved it by means of the theory that Israel's heart had been hardened. It could not be that the Jews should be excluded from salvation, unless God willed it to be so; He must, therefore, not only have permitted it, but caused it, as a means to an end. This conception, Weiss held, is presupposed by Mark, and exhibited by him as active in the life of Jesus. It is the Evangelist who puts into His mouth the hard saying about teaching by parables—"that hearing they may not hear." The Jews failed to discern the Messiah because the mystery of the Kingdom was deliberately withheld from them. It is to the Evangelist, again, that we owe the record of the repeated injunctions to silence—silence about Jesus as the Christ, and about His works of power. These injunctions have the same meaning as the saying about parables: it is intended that the people shall not know that the Christ is among them. The dogmatic artificiality of all this is unmistakable. Not that—as Wrede held—Messiahship was never attributed to Jesus in His lifetime: what Mark says is that it was concealed only from the unbelieving people, until the time should come when the hidden thing must be made manifest. Hence came the repeated injunction to silence; hence the feature, so often recurring and so unnaturally, that Jesus withdraws Himself; hence the many passages in which He is found imparting esoteric truth to the disciples; hence, above all, the broad lines on which the book is designed—telling of a frustrated activity in Israel, a period in which the teaching of the disciples predominates, and the crowning infidelity of the Jews at Jerusalem.

That all this results from the working over of the material in the interest of a theory is clear, on Weiss' view, from the many points of detail which clash with the general principle—

the free public activity of Jesus, His miracles, His widespread repute, the entry into Jerusalem. What has Mark done? He has given an unreal extension to something which, in his source, occurred but rarely: he has spread it broadcast over the Gospel. He wishes to show how it was just the greatest proof of the power of the Son of God that tended most to stiffen the unbelief of the people. And so the utterance of the Fourth Gospel, "For this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah saith, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts," might be taken as a motto for the Marcan Gospel as a whole, and especially for the first part of it. Mark handles the life of Jesus among His own people as a great but divinely frustrated adventure, the purpose of which was to throw the Jews into the ruin for which they were destined.

It is to be remembered that in all this Weiss is attempting to provide a solvent which will enable us to disengage from the Gospel its writer's own specific contribution, and so to move backwards one step nearer to the primitive Gospel. Now this involves presuppositions which need to be examined.

When Mark is described as a work of didactic edification, it is necessary to remind oneself that it would be vain to imagine, and a hopeless task to reconstruct, any Gospel which would not bear this character. It is not enough to say that our Gospels are not biographies. It is necessary to add that from the character of their Subject, from the nature and intensity of the devotion which He inspired, and from the fact that He was the Hero of a cause, it is unthinkable that His story could ever have been told without a strong didactic interest—of one kind or another. If Caiaphas or Gamaliel had written a life of Jesus their achievement would not have failed to show a very definite colour. Much more is it certain that any narrative of the kind originating within the circle of the followers of Jesus must always have had a purpose—a purpose of propaganda, the design of making the reader or hearer take its central Figure at the valuation which the narrator had come to put upon Him. As, then, there can never have been any motive for writing a colourless life of Jesus, there was never a pre-evangelic εὐαγγέλιον.

So far, Weiss would have agreed with what I have written; on the other hand, he clearly does presuppose that there was once a pre-Pauline εὐαγγέλιον, and that we can discover by analysis something of its character.

It is just at this point that special caution is required. It is very doubtful whether we know enough as to the genesis of Pauline theology, as to the amount and character of the tradition which St. Paul took over from the original Christian community, as to the types of thought which he found current among the

brethren at his conversion, to warrant us in using the words of "Pauline" and "pre-Pauline" with any freedom. Weiss himself was well aware of this difficulty. Speaking of the evidence available in the Pauline epistles for the study of primitive Christianity, he wrote:* "Not only was Paul in close touch with the Church in Jerusalem, not only does he record or refer to utterances of the Lord, but he makes it plain that even where he does not expressly say so, he is dependent on the primitive Christian stock of thought. A close enquiry into his religion and theology reveals the fact that even where specifically Pauline conceptions are discernible, a primitive Christian basis lies behind them which has not been entirely absorbed. . . . The accidental circumstance that we know so much about Paul and so little about his presuppositions, together with the overmastering influence of his personality, makes it all but impossible to give adequate recognition to the primitive elements in his teaching. We are far too apt to treat everything that we find in the Epistles as Pauline; a closer and more subtle enquiry will be needed if the earlier and later elements are to be distinguished with any accuracy."

Using, then, the caution which Weiss himself so candidly suggests, we may consider the thesis that the Pauline idea of πώρωσις has strongly influenced the substance and arrangement of St. Mark. What is that idea? Not merely a predestinarian conviction that the Divine will has dimmed the spiritual perception of the Jews; but also a belief that, on the one hand, when the fulness of the Gentiles has been gathered in, the πώρωσις of the Jew will pass away, and, on the other, that the πώρωσις is itself the result of a definite and conscious refusal of Israel to hear: "I say, Did not Israel know? . . . All the day long I stretched out My hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people." The predestinarian element in this conception finds no expression except when St. Paul is addressing himself to Gentiles, and warning them against the peril of pride; never could he have said to the Jews, "You have not listened, because it was never intended that you should hear."

The πώρωσις conception is threefold; and only one of its elements is taken by Weiss to have influenced the mind of Mark. We are asked to see in his Gospel a reflection merely of the belief that the Jewish rejection of Jesus was due to a Divine intervention which hid the light from them.

I am not concerned to show that there is nothing in Mark which reflects such teaching as St. Paul could have endorsed. But I doubt (*a*) whether the impression given by the Gospel, as a whole, supports Weiss' analysis, and (*b*) whether the theory

* *Das Urchristentum*, i. 3.

of πώρωσις was so superimposed by Mark upon his sources that we can dissect it away, and leave a genuine pre-Pauline Gospel as a residuum.

The passages upon which Weiss' theory relies fall under four heads: (*a*) The injunctions to silence, (*b*) the conflict-scenes throughout the Gospel, (*c*) the scene at Nazareth, and (*d*) the saying about parables. Of these it seems to me that (*d*) alone has real weight, and that in itself it is too slender a basis for the theory. The injunctions to silence will not bear the construction that is put upon them. Weiss smooths the way for himself by excising those injunctions which in our Marcan text occur outside the limits of Israel; yet even if these are subtracted the impression left by the remainder is not that Jesus is for ever withholding from the multitude a light which could have saved them, but rather that He is guarding Himself against an excessive estimate of the significance of His acts of healing. Nor is the main impression left by the Gospel that of the πώρωσις of the people as a whole. In the story of the rejection of Jesus it is the Pharisees, rather than the people, who fill the foreground, and the writer is not enough of a conscious designer to paint the subtle picture which Weiss ascribes to him.

But this negative conclusion leads on to a positive consideration which is more important. The fact that our Lord was rejected by His own people, and put to death at the instance of Jewish authorities, must have formed a part of the Christian κήρυγμα from the very first; and there is evidence that very early indeed it was felt to need some explanation. If we are entitled to use the speeches in Acts as evidence for an early type of Christology, we are entitled to use them for confirmation at this point. ὑμεῖς τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἠρνήσασθε . . . τοῦτον προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε: with utterances like these it is reasonable to group others as coming from the earliest stratum of tradition—those which refer the betrayal and death of Jesus to the "predetermined counsel and knowledge of God," and interpret it in terms of prophecy. Those historical summaries which are the prelude to Christian apologetic in the Acts may well represent a very early line of Christian defence; and, if so, they indicate that the problem of Jewish unbelief was felt from the first. The words τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν are attributed to St. Paul in the Acts: I do not see why he could not have learnt to use language like this from those who were in Christ before him.

I should contend, therefore, that such indications as we find in Mark of the pressure of this problem are not to be taken as evidence of "Paulinism," but as showing that Mark had to tell a tale which, of necessity, involved a problem, and was

felt to do so from the first. Indeed, since there can never have been an εὐαγγελιον which was not the story of One who was rejected, I suggest that here we have an archetypal form, a type to which all Gospel narratives must conform. Εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν. καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον summarizes the ultimate Gospel behind which analysis need not hope to penetrate. These words of the Johannine prologue also summarize the Marcan narrative. Like the Fourth Gospel, the second is a narrative of acceptance and rejection: like the Second Gospel, the Fourth, in its main outline, tells the story in the way in which, from its nature, it was bound to be told.

H. N. Bate.

BARLOW ONCE MORE

For nearly three hundred years the ghost of William Barlow, sometime Bishop of St. David's and of other sees, walked in many volumes of controversy. He had been the principal consecrator of Matthew Parker in the year 1559, and in the year 1613 it was discovered that the records of his own consecration were missing. No doubt as to the fact had ever been hinted. From the year 1536 onward he had passed as a bishop unchallenged through troublous times, when men were not lacking who would be glad to expose any irregularity in his promotion; now, after seventy-seven years, a question was raised and acutely debated. The object was to throw a doubt on the consecration of Parker, and of the whole English hierarchy as derived from him. In the fifth volume of the *Birmingham Catholic Magazine* Lingard made some caustic remarks on this procedure, but it continued, and many years afterwards the matter was treated with considerable detail by Canon Estcourt in his *Question of Anglican Ordinations*. He was answered by Mr. Denny and myself, among others, in our book *De Hierarchia Anglicana*. Every scrap of evidence was examined by the Papal Commission in 1896. But the Bull which was issued later in the year contained no mention of Barlow.

The uneasy ghost seemed to have been laid. I had the honour of waiting on Cardinal Mazzella, when president of the Commission, to present a copy of a document bearing on the case. He received me rather ungraciously, saying gruffly: "It is of no importance." I was of the same opinion, though perhaps on other grounds, but as a member of the Commission had asked me to procure the copy I thought that a word of thanks might not have been amiss. I agreed, however, that it was of no importance, and that for a good reason.

It is inconceivable that the existence of a hierarchy, validly

constituted, should depend on the production of documents proving the consecration of a certain bishop at some time in the past. If that were necessary, no bishop anywhere in the Church would have an unchallengeable title, for in the line of his descent by successive ordination there would certainly be found some one consecrator of whose own consecration there is no such evidence. Only at Lingard's standpoint is there security; failing direct evidence, a man must be reputed bishop who passed for a bishop among his contemporaries. Barlow so passed for a bishop. The conclusion is imperative. Let it not be said that the word is ambiguous, so that Barlow may have passed for some sort of bishop, without being accepted as bishop in the Catholic sense. Among his contemporaries were men like Gardiner, Heath, and Tunstal, who are not to be suspected of any departure from the Catholic sense, and who recognized him as a brother-bishop without question. During the reaction after the death of Edward VI. he was deprived of his see, but his episcopal character was not challenged. It is now too late to challenge it.

Yet Monsignor Barnes has once more tried to raise the poor ghost.* But with a difference. His book, he allows, "has no longer the same controversial value" as, for example, that of Estcourt. Like Cardinal Mazzella, and probably for the same reason, he thinks the documents are of no importance. The practical question, he says, "has been decided by authority at Rome." But he hopes that the publication "may be thought to be justified as a study purely historical, even if it have no practical value in the controversies of to-day." Agreeing with him in this, let us examine his work as he presents it.

The story of Barlow, he adds, is curious. There I cannot agree with him. It seems to me commonplace. What is curious is the use that was formerly made of it in controversy; and though Monsignor Barnes abjures controversy, his new method is so like the old that there are curious features in his treatment of the subject. By a diligent use of conjecture he imports into the story some singular circumstances of which there is no evidence in the scanty records of Barlow's ordinary and rather sordid career, and he attributes to contemporaries a curiosity—to vary the meaning of the word—about his promotion which was unheard of until it acquired a controversial interest. His study bears marks of a painstaking diligence, which is impaired by a strange want of historical perspective, and by what I should call in controversial work an equally strange lack of dialectic; for he puts forward in support of his conclusion facts

* *Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders: A Study of the Original Documents* By Arthur Stapylton Barnes, M.A. Longmans. 12s. 6d. net.

and theories which tell heavily against him. He does not appear to have read much but what is in Estcourt, but he has to his credit one original discovery which is of real interest. I will come to this presently.

But first let us examine his thesis. It is not new; he takes it over from Estcourt. He supposes that towards the end of the year 1535 Henry, who was at that time negotiating an alliance with the Lutherans of the Schmalkaldic League, conceived the idea of doing what the King of Denmark had already done, securing the appointment of bishops who should be elected and confirmed under his authority, but who should not be consecrated. Monsignor Barnes, by the way, confuses this policy of Frederick I. of Denmark with the much more drastic procedure of his successor Christian III. Such a scheme was quite feasible. By an established abuse, bishoprics had been held, and long continued to be held, on these terms. Henri de Bourbon, in the seventeenth century, so held the see of Metz for forty years. Under the provisions of the Treaty of Westphalia, the see of Osnaburg was alternately filled in the ordinary way, and conferred on a prince of the Electoral House of Hanover; George I. of England held it in his youth, and the second son of George III., afterwards Duke of York, served his first campaigns in Flanders under the title of Bishop of Osnaburg. The unseemly arrangement has left its mark on the naming of streets in London. The supposed scheme was, therefore, feasible. In all such cases the administration of the diocese was carried on by the Bishop-elect, or in his name; functions for which a consecrated bishop was required, such as ordinations and confirmations, were supplied by casual helpers or by a regular coadjutor. So it was done in Denmark under Frederick. But Monsignor Barnes supposes further that Henry intended to advance in the footsteps of Christian III., and dispense altogether with the consecration of bishops. With this intention the King sought some fitting tools for his purpose, and found them in Barlow and Cranmer. Accordingly, in February, 1536, Barlow was elected to the see of St. Asaph, and the election was confirmed by Cranmer, but he was not consecrated. Two months later he was elected and confirmed to St. David's, but still was not consecrated, and so Henry's plan was carried out. Such is the case presented.

Evidence of this design is sought in the fact that five years later the King submitted to certain bishops some theological questions, one of which asked " Whether in the New Testament be required any Consecration of a Bishop and Priest, or only appointment to the office be sufficient ?" The question is obviously academic, and its limitations should be noted; the

King asked only whether the requirement of consecration could be found "in the New Testament." Five manuscript copies of answers are extant. In one of them (Lambeth, 1108) Cranmer replies, with careful adhesion to the terms of the question, "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointment thereto is sufficient." There is a curt note, attributing to Barlow the opinion, "That only the appointing." These replies should suit Monsignor Barnes' argument, though he has unaccountably overlooked them. But another manuscript (Cotton; Cleopatra, E. v. 39), evidently a fair copy written for submission to the King, and containing a note from his own hand, gives a very different answer, assigned in the margin to Cranmer and Barlow jointly: "Only appointment is not sufficient, but Consecration, that is to say, Imposition of hands with fasting and prayer is also required. For so the Apostles used to order them that were appointed, and so have been used continually; and we have not read the contrary." The only possible explanation of the discrepancy appears to be that in the one document Cranmer and Barlow give their own academic opinion, while in the other they give that which must be followed in practice, or perhaps that which they suppose the King to desire. Monsignor Barnes quotes this. It is strange evidence to adduce in favour of a supposition that Henry and they had recently been conspiring to dispense with consecration, and that Barlow himself was still evading it.

There is in this connection a further indication of Monsignor Barnes' imperfect reasoning. He quotes on his title-page a sentence written by Cranmer's predecessor, Warham: "A man is not made Bishop by consecration, but is pronounced so at Rome in Consistory; and he has no jurisdiction given him by consecration, but only the rights of his Order, namely, consecration of children, et cætera." On this he argues with justice that it would be easy for Barlow to hold his bishopric indefinitely without consecration, exercising the jurisdiction of his office and enjoying its fruits. What he does not see is that the same distinction between "making" and consecrating a bishop appears in these questions of 1540. The twelfth question, of which I have spoken, touched upon consecration; the ninth asked, "Whether the Apostles lacking a Higher Power, as in not having a Christian King among them, made Bishops by that Necessity, or by Authority given by God?" In the former of the above-mentioned papers, Cranmer replies with a rambling statement, the gist of which is that in the first days of the Church, "when there were no Christian Princes by whose authority Ministers of God's Word might be appointed," such Ministers

were chosen by various kinds of election. But in the other paper he addresses himself more closely to the question: "Making of Bishops hath two parts, Appointment and Ordering. Appointment, which the Apostles by necessity made by common election, and sometime by their own several assignment, could not then be done by Christian princes, because at that time they were not; and now at these days appertaineth to Christian princes and rulers. But in the Ordering wherein grace is conferred (as afore) the Apostles did follow the rule taught by the Holy Ghost. *Per manuum impositionem cum oratione et ieiunio.*" Cranmer, then, while recognizing a distinction, objected to a severance of the two things distinguished, and contended that ordination or consecration was an integral part of the "making" of a bishop. He was casting back to an earlier and better tradition. The sharp distinction between appointment and consecration, the preconization of bishops in Consistory with consecration to follow as by an afterthought, and the frequent tenure of bishoprics by men who were not in holy orders—Cesare Borgia a recent and conspicuous example—raised awkward questions. Sir Thomas More wrote that the Christian converts among his Utopians, being without a hierarchy, "had great disputes among themselves, whether one chosen by them to be a priest would not be thereby qualified to do all things belonging to that character, even though he had no authority derived from the Pope." Such questions were in the air. Henry was likely to be interested in them, and had probably discussed them with More; but from academic questioning to practical innovation is a long step, and there is no evidence that he ever moved so far.

There is no evidence, I say; for what Monsignor Barnes offers can hardly be reckoned such. He knows that the mere absence of documents relating to Barlow's consecration argues nothing, but he seems to think that a collection of suspicious circumstances amounts to a cumulative proof. Some of his suspicions evoke a smile. He gravely notes that Barlow was sometimes called bishop, and signed himself "Meneuiensis" while not yet consecrated. But he has forgotten his title-page. This kind of thing was constantly done, for the reason stated by Warham. The correct title, indeed, was "Bishop-elect," but the adjective was freely neglected. Other suspicions are equally gratuitous. Monsignor Barnes knows that the absence of documents relating to the consecration proves nothing, and at most suggests a doubt, but he exaggerates the facts. He says that the *significauit* is missing. This was a patent, signifying the King's assent to the election by the Chapter, and directing the Archbishop to proceed. Its nature was determined by the Act 25

Henry VIII., Cap. 20: "The King's Highness, by his Letters Patents under his great seal, shall signify the said election . . . to the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Province . . . requiring and commanding such Archbishop, to whom any such signification shall be made, to confirm the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto, and to give and use to him all such benedictions, ceremonies, and other things requisite for the same." No such patent for Barlow's promotion to St. David's is extant, nor is it on the Patent Roll (of which below), but there exists in the Record Office a Signed Bill directing its issue, and reciting its terms, so that it is known to have existed. After stating the facts of the election, it concludes with the words, "regium assensum adhibuimus et fauorem, et hoc uobis tenore praesentium significamus ut quod uestrum est in hac parte exequamini."

It is explicit in the sense of the Act. The King "signifies" the election, and bids the Archbishop do his part. His part was to confirm and consecrate; if he stopped short at confirming he would be subject, under the Act, to the penalties of *præmunire*. Monsignor Barnes, however, supposes that a second patent was required for the consecration, the above being only a letter of assent to the election; he goes so far as to say, in face of the word *significamus*, that this is not a "*significauit*." He is misled by the fact that other forms of the patent were used, going more into detail, and that in some cases two were issued. But there is nothing in the Act requiring the two, and Cranmer is known from his register to have consecrated more than one bishop with this shorter form alone. It is a complete mistake, therefore, to say that Barlow's *significauit* is wanting.

Monsignor Barnes unconsciously reveals the working of his mind in his comments on this Signed Bill. Possessed by his notion of a dark design, he gravely argues that this purely formal document under the King's Sign Manual indicates a particular and personal interest in Barlow's case. One wonders whether he has ever seen a Signed Bill. I myself made a mistake about this very document in my note addressed to Cardinal Mazzella, six-and-twenty years ago, so that I speak sympathetically. But not here alone does Monsignor Barnes, lynx-eyed, detect the King's own hand in official letters. There is also the Custody. This patent requires a brief explanation.

When a bishopric fell vacant, the King took possession of the temporalties of the see, restoring them to the new bishop when consecrated. It was the usual thing, also, to make him a grant of the revenues accumulated during the vacancy. But the King could grant the custody of the temporalties for

the term of the vacancy to a favoured person, who was then entitled to the use of the fruits. When Barlow was elected to St. David's, he was engaged in the King's business in Scotland and elsewhere, and his consecration was likely to be delayed, as was the case with Bonner two years later. To provide him with funds in the interval, a Custody was therefore granted him. It was an ordinary piece of business, but Monsignor Barnes finds the patent "a very remarkable document, which will require our very careful attention, and will repay a very minute examination." There appear, as a result of this, some trifling peculiarities or mistakes in the drafting, together with two outstanding and portentous features.

In the first place the Custody is not granted, as usual, for the term of the vacancy, but *durante uita sua*. Barlow was to have a life-long occupancy; all his life long he was to enjoy the fruits of the vacancy. Evidently, then, he was not to be consecrated; for then the vacancy would be terminated. Here is proof positive of the conspiracy. This was originally a mare's nest discovered by Estcourt, but Monsignor Barnes makes himself thoroughly at home in it. A little reflection is enough to show that the words are surplusage for the intention supposed; even without them the grantee would retain the Custody all his life, if the vacancy continued so long. The words do not extend the grant, but impose a limit; without them the Custody would pass to his heirs if he died during the vacancy; in a word, they confine the grant to a life-interest.

The other evidence of Henry's personal intervention is found in the description of Cranmer as "Legate of the Apostolic See," a title which he had formally renounced some eighteen months earlier by a synodical act in Convocation. A reader of ordinary insight would put this down to the carelessness of a Clerk of the Chancery, following an obsolete precedent. But Monsignor Barnes looks deeper. "Would any single person have dared to do it," he asks, "except the King in person?" So we have an edifying picture of Henry, deeply occupied with affairs of State, and just on the point of sending his Queen to the Tower under a charge of treason, yet bending his great powers of mind to the regulation of phrases in a commonplace instrument of administration. And why should he have wished to use this particular phrase? He might be supposed to regard it with aversion. On this point Monsignor Barnes is silent.

A general motive for the King's intervention, however, is found. The object was to shroud the whole design in secrecy. For this purpose he juggled with Letters Patent so as to "make the Precentor and Canons of St. David's imagine that Barlow had been already consecrated as Bishop of St. Asaph." The

trickery was amazingly successful. No hint of the great design escaped. None of Barlow's enemies got wind of it. Twenty years afterwards, when he was appointed to consecrate Parker, "We may feel sure," says Monsignor Barnes, "that no suspicion whatever of his irregular position, or of the fact that he had never been consecrated, occurred to Elizabeth, or to the Archbishop himself." One can understand Barlow's secrecy; an exposure might have had serious consequences for him. Monsignor Barnes writes for a moment quite sympathetically: "All his life he must have lived conscious that he was in danger of such a happening. That Henry VIII. was involved, and was even the actual cause of the whole affair, would, as he well knew, avail him nothing if it suited that King to call him to account." But why the King's secret? The whole affair was a *ballon d'essai*, says Monsignor Barnes, and it was successful. Henry had satisfied himself that he could, if he wished, make a State bishop "in the Danish sense." But he did not care to go on doing it. Moreover, by the spring of 1536, "the whole situation had changed as on the turn of a kaleidoscope." He was tired of Anne, and was getting rid of her; there was no longer any leaning to the Lutherans. Then why go on with the plot? "Henry," we are told, "was not a person who liked recanting." Probably not; but there was nothing to recant, for Barlow's consecration was hardly due yet, and on the slightest hint from Henry he and Cranmer would have set about it. But if the King insisted on secrecy, how did he secure it? Monsignor Barnes speaks of "the very small number of highly placed officials who could not be kept from knowing what was going on." But what of the more numerous underlings who were employed about a consecration, and were rapacious after fees on such occasions? How could they fail to note the loss of an opportunity? How should they fail to report it where it could be used by Cranmer's enemies? There is no explanation, except that the plot never had any existence except in the mind of Monsignor Barnes. His whole story is a work of imagination. It does him credit. It is worthy of Dumas.

There is an epilogue. In the year 1559 Barlow consecrated Parker, and Parker afterwards consecrated many bishops. One of these, Horne of Winchester, had occasion to administer the Oath of Supremacy to Bonner, the extruded Bishop of London, then lying in the Marshalsea. To refuse the oath, when tendered by a bishop, was treason. Bonner refused, and was indicted. His plea in defence, according to Dyer's Reports, was that Horne "non fuit episcopus tempore oblationis sacramenti," and so was not qualified to administer the oath. The plea was examined by the judges in Chambers at Serjeant's Inn, and passed for a jury, but ultimately the prosecution was dropped.

The arguments are not recorded, but a Manuscript is extant containing a statement in Bonner's own hand of the grounds on which he acted. The two most important paragraphs are quoted by Monsignor Barnes, not quite accurately, from Strype (*Annals*, Vol. I., Chapter xxxiv.), whose own transcript is faulty. The original (Harleian, 241, 4) is a rough draft with many interlineations. The second paragraph runs as follows:

"*Item.*—That the said Mr. Robert Horne, not being lawful Bishop of Winchester, but an usurper, intruder and no lawful possessioner thereof, as well for that according to the laws of the Catholic Church, and the statutes and ordinances of this realm, the said Mr. Robert Horne was not elected consecrated or provided, as also according to the Canons of the Catholic Church he, the said Mr. Robert, came not to the same dignity, or was eligible to the same, but as a person infamed, unworthy, and utterly unmeet for the same, did take upon him the said office, most worthy to be repelled from the same."

The sheet containing the fifth paragraph is torn on the right margin, but the missing syllables can easily be supplied, except in the case of the concluding words. Strype made no attempt at these, and omitted the "and" introducing them. I venture to suggest the addition of "could not have." The text, with syllables supplied, is as follows:

"*Item.*—That Dr. Horne foresaid is no la[wful] bishop neither concerning the tenderi[ng of the] said oath or other things foresaid nor exercise of other ecclesiastical [office] for many causes and specially for that he the said [Dr. Horne was not] lawfully consecrated according to the laws and sta[tutes of this] realm, especially the statute of xxv^to^ of [Henry 8] cap. 20. Where in effect is required that [he that is] to be consecrated must among other things have one archbish[op and ii] bishops or else iiij bishops at his [consecration] which the said Dr. Horne had not and——"

It is evident from the last words that Bonner challenged Parker as no archbishop. Upon this Monsignor Barnes gets his imagination once more into harness. Thinking always in terms of his own subject, he pictures the Crown lawyers engaged in proving that Parker's consecrators were themselves consecrated; there was no difficulty about the other three, but to their surprise they found nothing recorded of Barlow. He sees them posting down to Chichester, where the old man now was, and learning from him "the fact, which probably no one at that time was suspecting, that he had never been consecrated at all." There was nothing for it but to hush up the story, and drop the proceedings against Bonner.

Ingenious. But this again is a mare's nest, and the discovery is inexcusable. Monsignor Barnes has once more for-

gotten his title-page. Horne's competence was not a question of Order, but of Jurisdiction. He might be unconsecrated, and yet qualified to act as bishop; he might be consecrated, and yet unqualified. Monsignor Barnes thinks that Bonner "drew his bow at a venture," and hit Barlow. He was much too good a lawyer to do anything so foolish; he had a perfectly good case, and knew it. His use of the word "consecrated" affords some excuse for Monsignor Barnes's blunder, but the stress is on the adverb, "lawfully consecrated." The reference to "laws of the Catholic Church" is probably a glance at Horne's schismatical standing, and could not be used in argument before Elizabeth's courts; but the reference to "the laws and statutes of this realm" was Bonner's deadly thrust. The legal standing of Parker and Horne depended on the observance of Henry's statute, which had been revived in the first year of Elizabeth. By this Act the promotion of a bishop was committed to "one archbishop and two other bishops, or else to four bishops within this realm or within any other of the King's dominions." Bishops within the King's dominions could mean only such as were actually holding sees therein. Of the four who confirmed and consecrated Parker, Hodgekin, the Suffragan of Bedford, answered to this description, for there is abundant evidence that such anomalous suffragans were so estimated, and he had been continuously in function since the year 1537. The other three, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale, were not "bishops within this realm." If Elizabeth had recalled them to the sees from which they had been removed by Mary, they would have had a colourable title, but this had not been done; they were "episcopi vagi," and as such competent to consecrate in a theological sense, but they were certainly not competent to "make" a bishop in the sense of the statute. It was evidently for this reason that the famous "Supplentes" clause was added to the Letters Patent under which they acted, it being thought that the Queen, either by prerogative or by her statutory power as "Supreme Governor," could make good their deficiency of title. Failing this, Parker had no legal standing whatever, and so neither had Horne.

This was the issue. The judges in chambers decided that Bonner's plea was good enough to go to a jury. This meant that the effect of the "Supplentes" clause was at least in doubt. Litigation about it would be awkward; Philip of Spain interested himself in the affair, and on November 13 his ambassador was able to inform him that the case against Bonner was suspended. It was never resumed. The bishops were left in a difficult position with a defective title. As the defect was purely statutory, it could be rectified by another statute.

This was done in the Parliament of 1566 by a retrospective Act, with a cumbrous preamble confusing the issue, but revealing in it a reference to the "Supplentes" clause, which declared all promotions of bishops made since the Queen's accession to be legally valid.

It is evident that in Bonner's case no question about Barlow's consecration was raised, or could have been raised. It would be irrelevant. There was a question of Jurisdiction, not of Order. It is interesting to observe that Parker did not stay his hand because of his doubtful title. He confirmed and consecrated two more bishops, Llandaff and Bangor, before the declaratory Act was passed.

I have reserved a remark on the one real discovery made by Monsignor Barnes. It is much to his credit. Carefully examining the Patent Roll of 1536, he found that it had been mutilated. I myself am one of many who have explored this Roll for Barlow's patents, and have been puzzled by the absence of some; Monsignor Barnes is the first to discover the reason. A Roll consists of many skins of parchment, on which copies of Letters Patent are transcribed; the skins, as they were filled up, were sewn together in a long strip. Monsignor Barnes discovered that some skins—he cannot say how many, for they were not originally numbered, as now—have been abstracted from the middle of the Roll, the dissevered parts being sewn together again. It is impossible to ascertain when the mutilation took place. Monsignor Barnes tries to find an approximate date, but his argument turns in part upon a reference given by Francis Mason, who was very slovenly and inaccurate in such matters, in part upon his own misunderstanding of the Grant of Custody, which Mason even more egregiously misunderstood. For he mounts his hobby again, and will have it that the missing skins were abstracted for the purpose of obscuring the facts about Barlow. It is a fantastic notion. The custodians of the Rolls were not likely to be interested in Barlow, and the missing membranes would contain far more important documents than his. What Monsignor Barnes does not observe is that his discovery destroys whatever significance there may have seemed to be in the lack of Barlow's patents; it accounts for their disappearance.

I have spent more time on the book than it deserves. Monsignor Barnes attracted me by his disclaimer of controversy, his quotation from Warham promised something new, and I had greatly admired his monograph on the Tomb of St. Peter. The result is disappointing. I cannot congratulate him on his travels in this other little byway of history.

T. A. Lacey.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

REUNION

Sir,

I am ashamed to say that only two days ago did I see for the first time Fr. Wilfred Knox's review of Fr. L. Walker's *The Problem of Reunion* in your issue for September, 1920, and Fr. Walker's letter of September 10, 1920; and I wonder if you will think me too belated to be allowed to say anything on the subject. The point which concerns me is this: Fr. Knox stated that "the bulk of those who seceded (in 1662) were intruded ministers who had not received episcopal ordination, and . . . the main reason for their secession was the demand that they should submit to such ordination." Such is undoubtedly the fact, as I think no one acquainted with the contemporary literature can doubt. Fr. Walker was thought, by Fr. Knox, to have passed it over, and Fr. Walker agreed that he had regarded it as a minor point, and referred to my *History of the Church of England*, 1625-1714, as showing that he was at one with me. May I be allowed to say that I believe that Fr. Walker wrongly interpreted the action of those who withdrew on St. Bartholomew's Day? I think that the contemporary evidence quite clearly proves that they did so not because the contentions of their representatives at the Savoy Conference were not accepted, but because they were required by law, in order to have benefices, to accept the Prayer Book which required episcopal ordination. It is simply a matter of fact. They could not hold benefices unless they were episcopally ordained; and they would not consent to be ordained or to express agreement with the Prayer Book, which required ordination. I stated this explicitly on p. 192 of my book.

W. H. Hutton.

DOCUMENT

AUSTRALIA AND REUNION*

The official report of the proceedings of the Reunion Conference between representatives of the Anglican Presbyterian Methodist and Congregationalist Churches in Australia, held at the Church House, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on March 28-29, 1922, has lately been published, and contains much of general interest.

The Conference was the result of an invitation issued by the Reunion Committee of General Synod to those Churches which were already contemplating Reunion among themselves—namely, the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists—and by this means the difficulty was avoided of having to ask a number of small Churches which would have expected representation altogether out of proportion to their importance, and would probably have overwhelmed the Conference with a flood of talk, contributing little or nothing to the real points at issue, which were, in brief, the extent to which the truths contained in the Presbyterian and Congregational ideals of Church government could find a place with episcopacy in a Reunited Church.

The Anglican representatives were the Archbishops of Sydney and Brisbane, the Bishops of Bathurst, Goulburn, and Willochra, the Dean

* By the Bishop of Willochra, Rt. Rev. Gilbert White, D.D.

of Sydney, Archdeacon Davies, Canons Hughes and Batty, Rev. P. A. Micklem, Hon. L. E. Groom, M.H.R., and Mr. C. R. Walsh. The Presbyterian representatives were Rev. J. Gibson, Moderator-General, Professor A. Harper, Professors Angus and Adam, Revs. J. Burgess, G. Tait, J. T. Robertson and Principal Glaister.

The Methodists were Revs. Dr. Carruthers, Dr. Prescott, Dr. Youngman, W. H. Howard, A. T. Holden, G. Hall and Hon. W. M. Williams, M.L.C.

The Congregational representatives were Rev. E. Davies (President of the Congregational Union of Australia), Principal Thatcher, Revs. J. E. James, W. L. Patison, A. P. Campbell, A. de Pledge Sykes, A. Deans, and F. V. Pratt.

The list was entirely representative, for the various Churches took the invitation very seriously, and sent in each case their best men. It is also to be noted that the utmost harmony and good feeling prevailed throughout. The only approach to excited feeling was a slight domestic difference of opinion between the majority and a minority of the Presbyterian representatives, relative to their already proposed union with the Methodists and Congregationalists.

The subject of the Lambeth Appeal was introduced by the Bishop of Willochra, who, after explaining and commending the Appeal, said that the policy of having practically no principles at all in a Reunited Church, and admitting to full membership everyone who acknowledged Christ as Lord, in the vaguest sense, was utterly impossible. It was absolutely necessary to have a framework or backbone. A body without a skeleton might look all right when reclining on a couch, but it could neither walk nor work. It was also, he believed, a waste of time to try to include everybody and please everybody. We must start with the principle that everyone cannot be expected to agree to anything. To be all-inclusive was to be futile.

The subject of Episcopacy was introduced by Professor Harper (Presbyterian), in a powerful paper on "Non-Episcopal Views of Episcopacy." In his opinion episcopacy might be accepted if

(1) It did not absolutely exclude presbyteral ordination.

(2) Bishops should be elected by the Christian people of the diocese.

(3) The highest Church assembly should have some voice in the choice.

(4) All administrative acts of bishops should be open to review by that assembly.

(5) That assembly should consist of equal numbers (*a*) of presbyters all of the same grade and (*b*) of selected laymen, and that they should vote together on all questions.

The Bishop of Bathurst said that there was no anti-democratic feeling in the Anglican Church in Australia, but the one thing needed to save democracy was the capacity to find leaders. The office of a bishop was an office of leadership. Bishops in Australia had the right of vetoing acts of diocesan synod, but he did not know of a case of the right being exercised.

Canon Batty said that the Church of England no longer said "We are right and you are wrong," but "We are all wrong; we can none of us claim to represent the Catholic Church in its fulness." Every other form of ordination was questioned by some, the episcopal method alone by none.

Rev. Dr. Prescott (Methodist) asked if any alternative suggestion had been or could be put forth to episcopacy. He thought that a practical and effective union could be effected only on that basis. The whole

question was fully debated, and finally the following resolution was passed with practical unanimity:

"That while the right of the Church to determine its own polity at any time is recognized, in the opinion of this Conference, in view of all the circumstances, it is expedient that the polity of the reunited Church be episcopal, provided that (1) the appointment to the office of a bishop be shared in by ministry and laity; (2) that such office be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner—*i.e.*, that in all administrative actions, the bishop should be responsible to the representative assembly, conference, or synod of the Church; and (3) that such acceptance of episcopacy does not necessarily imply that ministerial authority cannot be otherwise obtained or that episcopacy is the only channel of divine grace."

The second subject of the Conference was Ordination, which was introduced by Rev. A. de Pledge Sykes (Congregationalist) in a very beautiful and spiritual paper, in which he insisted on the sacramental element in ordination. It is interesting to note that since the Conference Mr. Sykes, who is one of the most prominent and most intellectual of the Congregationalists in Australia, has been accepted as a candidate for ordination by the Bishop of Adelaide, and will shortly be ordained deacon. I do not, however, think that his example will be largely followed. The discussion on ordination was long, full, and courteous; but it brought out one thing most unmistakably, which was that the representatives of the non-episcopal Churches, however favourable to the Lambeth proposals, and they were most favourably received, and however ready to accept a representative and constitutional episcopacy, and the disposition to accept episcopacy was unexpectedly widespread, yet were not prepared to take any action, or agree to any proposals which explicitly or implicitly denied the validity of their present orders. They were most of them ready to consent to episcopal ordination, so far as I gathered, if it meant (*a*) a personal concession to the scruples of what they regarded as weaker brethren and (*b*) a means of qualifying for ministry in a larger United Catholic Church, in the same kind of way that ordination to the priesthood or the episcopate implies an ordination to a wider sphere of work but not a repudiation of either the diaconate or the priesthood, but they definitely claimed that they were already ordained not merely to the ministry of Presbyterianism or Methodism, but to the presbyterate of the Catholic Church as Christ founded it and meant it. They claimed that the Lambeth Appeal spoke on this point with a divided and ambiguous voice; for while on the one hand it said that no one could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry, yet at the same time it required "a commission through episcopal ordination" which seemed to imply ordination *ab initio* and that their present ordination meant nothing at all. Finally, the following resolution was passed: "That the Conference recommends that the conditions for the mutual recognition of episcopal and non-episcopal orders and commissions be thoroughly explored by the respective Churches, and to this end recommends the appointment of a Committee for the purpose of receiving reports from such Churches, and ascertaining the possibility of arriving at a common mind, and reporting to a further Conference. That the Committee consist of the Bishop of Willochra (Convener), the secretaries of the Conference, and two representatives from each Church, making a total of eleven in all." The other Anglican representatives besides the Convener and Rev. P. A. Micklem (secretary) are the Dean of Sydney and Canon Hughes of St.

Peter's, Melbourne. The Committee has been summoned to meet in Melbourne on September 19. A meeting of the Reunion Committee of General Synod will be held on the previous day. It will be seen that the Conference Committee has no light task before it.

The next subject discussed was Possibilities of Immediate Action, and took the form of a discussion of a Memorandum submitted by the Bishop of Willochra and approved by the General Synod Reunion Committee of thd Church of England in Australia. It was as follows:

1. That a statement of agreement on points of Faith and Order should be drawn up on the lines, *e.g.*, of the statement of agreement issued by the Conference of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee and the Free Church Commission in 1916, and that the Churches already negotiating for Union with each other—*i.e.*, the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregationalist Churches together with the Anglican Church—should take the name of " Churches contemplating Reunion."

2. That a Central Office and Registry be established for Australia, and supported by *pro rata* contributions from all the " Churches contemplating Reunion."

3. A complete Record be kept of all communications and agreements between the " Churches contemplating Reunion " and a list of all ministers officiating and of their record and qualifications.

4. That each Church should hold its own property as at present, but that trustees be appointed in whom funds may be vested for the common use of the " Churches contemplating Reunion " with regard to—

(*a*) Synod Rooms, Halls, and Offices.
(*b*) Theological Faculties and Colleges.
(*c*) Superannuation and Insurance Funds.
(*d*) Sustentation Funds for approved objects.

5. There shall be a common Australian Council and State Councils, which shall meet from time to time, and shall consult—

(A) On matters of common interest, *e.g.*—

(1) Christian Missions.
(2) Social and economic questions.
(3) Public morality.
(4) Lectures and literature in defence of Christianity.
(5) Religious Education.
(6) Conferences on subjects connected with Reunion.
(7) United Prayer for Reunion.

(B) On matters with regard to which agreement is not yet reached, *e.g.*—

(i.) Matters of faith and order.
(ii.) Common study of Christian institutions.
(iii.) Plans for closer union.

The Council shall have power to appoint Committees on the above subjects, and to administer such funds as may be entrusted to it, and its members shall have office for three years. The number of the members of the Council shall correspond as far as possible to the relative number of members of the Churches concerned. It shall, however, be a rule that where a doubt occurs in the matter of numbers, it shall be decided in favour of the smaller rather than the larger Churches.

There was not time for a detailed discussion, and it was referred to a Committee, which met in June, and accepted paragraphs 1 and 5, but

altering the last paragraph so as to do away with the proportional representation. This is not at all likely to commend itself to the Anglican Church. The discussion of paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 was deferred. The last subject, that of the Creeds, was introduced by the Bishop of Goulburn in a brilliant speech. After a full discussion the following motion was carried on the motion of the Bishop of Bathurst: "That while conditions of membership in the Reunited Church might be satisfied by the Apostles' Creed, or some shorter and simpler form of personal confession of the Christian faith, a Corporate Creed would be necessary as a common standard precedent to union, and for this purpose the Nicene Creed would be a most appropriate and acceptable form."

It must be remembered that the General Synod Reunion Committee has no power to commit the Church in Australia to anything. It can only report to the next session, which may not be held for some years.

The chief points to be noted in the negotiations are—(1) The extraordinarily friendly and reasonable attitute of the non-Episcopal representatives towards the Church of England, (2) their general willingness to accept a constitutional episcopacy, (3) their invincible repugnance to admitting that they are not already presbyters of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, (4) their acceptance of the Nicene Creed as a Corporate Creed for the Reunited Church. Whether or no we can proceed further will depend largely on the ability of the Conference in September to solve the question raised in No. 3 above or to suggest acceptable forms for the episcopal ordination of non-episcopally ordained ministers. Whatever we do will have, of course, to be reviewed and revised by the full Conference, and then, so far as we are concerned, by General Synod. There is not much fear of moving too fast, but a great deal has been done in the last eighteen months. The Conference is to meet again early next year, if possible away from the great centres of population, and preceded by a half-day of prayer and spiritual communion. The Archbishop of Sydney presided with his accustomed skill and grace.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

[Under this heading we hope to give simple explanations of New Testament passages intended for the non-specialist reader. Special attention will be paid to those passages where the R.V. rendering is not universally accepted by present-day scholars.]

"Elijah with Moses," St. Mark ix. 4.

The following note is suggested by an article in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1921, by F. J. Badcock.

The Transfiguration has attracted a good deal of attention lately. Twenty years ago advanced critics were inclined to regard the story as mythical. To-day, when so much interest is taken in psychic phenomena, some not only find it credible but build a heavy superstructure on it. Frequently it is said to have been a Resurrection appearance. E. Meyer even maintains that "the Resurrection and the appearances of the Risen Lord have grown out of the Transfiguration; it is the final root of Christianity" (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, i. 156).

One question only can be asked here: What is the significance of Moses and Elijah? If St. Mark is the original source, and St. Matthew and St. Luke secondary, then Elijah is the primary figure, to whom Moses is joined. The later writers naturally arrange the two in chronological order.

Elijah was the typical prophet, whose return was to usher in the Day of the Lord (Mal. iv. 5). But Moses was a prophet too (see Deut. xviii. 15, xxxiv. 10; Hos. xii. 13), and to our Lord he was presumably a prophet first and foremost. It may be noted that in the Sermon on the Mount, which is so largely concerned with the attitude of the citizens of the new Kingdom towards the old law, Moses is not mentioned; though Matt. xxiii. 2, Mark x. 3, describe him as a law-giver. That these two figures appear in the narrative of the Transfiguration must presumably be connected with the belief that neither died in the ordinary course of nature: Moses was supposed to have been taken up into heaven (*cf.* the Assumption of Moses and Jude 9), and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. In 2 Macc. ii. 7, 8 a prophecy, put into the mouth of Jeremiah, said: "Yea and the place shall be unknown until God gather the people again together, and mercy come; and then shall the Lord disclose these things, and the glory of the Lord shall be seen, and the cloud, as also it was showed with Moses. . . ." (R.V. margin). The cloud that is associated with Moses was destined to reappear in the last days.

In what sense are we to suppose that the disciples *saw* Elijah and Moses? Any perception of disembodied spirits—such most readers would regard them, though the narrator may have thought of them as retaining bodies—must be on the psychic or spiritual plane. Whatever took place was primarily in our Lord's consciousness. We may suppose that the two great figures of God's people in the past were vividly present to Him—Moses the first of the prophets, Elijah the prophet who should herald the Messianic age—and that He communed with them in the spirit. For a brief space the disciples were able to enter into our Lord's consciousness and see with His eyes. Then their faith failed, and the vision passed; or, perhaps, He thought of other things, and the link which connected them with the unseen world was forthwith snapped. The cloud was not so much a material as a psychic cloud, if the expression may be allowed; though the great mystics would have felt no need to apologize for such a conception.

If such suggestions as these have any weight, the conversation on the way down from the mountain becomes less puzzling. Jesus plainly declares that Elijah is John the Baptist. If we take the appearance of Elijah at the Transfiguration in at all a literal sense, it is exceedingly difficult to see how he and John Baptist can be identified. The difficulty is removed if we may imagine our Lord's mind brooding now on the historic Elijah, now on his present-day counterpart.

The reader may recall a curious book published some years ago entitled *An Adventure*. Two ladies visited Versailles and had a strange psychic experience. They saw sights and heard sounds which had been non-existent since the eighteenth century. The story was ultimately pieced together after laborious research amongst old maps and records. They were inclined to explain what happened by supposing they had become *en rapport* with the mind of Marie Antoinette, as it was at a certain critical period. The book attracted wide attention at the time, and its *bona fide* character was undoubted. There is a good deal of evidence of a similar character, cogent to some minds, unsatisfying to others, illustrating what has been written above. The supposition that the mode in which the disciples experienced the Transfiguration was a sharing by them of a process taking place in our Lord's mind at least deserves to be considered.

REVIEWS

THE MODERN READER'S BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS (The Old Testament). By R. G. Moulton. Macmillan. 12s.

LESSONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT. Senior Course. 3 vols. New edition, 1922. By M. G. Glazebrook. Rivington. 6s. each.

A SCHOOL EDITION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. 1 (to the death of Saul). By D. Batho and A. L. Hyde. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

OLD TESTAMENT STORIES AND HOW TO TEACH THEM. By E. B. Redlich. Macmillan. 6s.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS TRANSLATED INTO COLLOQUIAL ENGLISH. By T. H. Robinson. National Adult School Union. 1s.

For the moment Old Testament study is in a relatively stable condition. The day of the popularizer has come, and these five volumes are all intended to help the teacher in his difficult task. The first three provide a text from which to work.

The Teaching Office of the Church Report strongly urged the preparation of a children's edition of the Bible, printed like an ordinary book. The double columns of existing Bibles, the chapters and verses, and the small print make the book unacceptable to boys and girls accustomed to ordinary books. How far the demand is practicable may be judged from the fact that the Bible is equal to about six *David Copperfields*. Printed in type which would satisfy eyesight experts and with the margins to which we are accustomed in other books, it would run to about 6,000 pages of an octavo book. What it would cost can be faintly imagined. The book before us is just about as large as a child could handle with comfort, contains over 500 pages, costs twelve shillings, and omits the New Testament. That it fails to take the place of the Bible may be judged by the omissions: Abraham and Moses are to all intents passed over in silence, as is all David's life before he became King. On the other hand, the prophets and psalms are well represented. Within its necessary limitations the book is about as good as it could be. The adult reader will find it a very good investment of twelve shillings. The literary skill of the editor cannot be too highly praised. Only we think he has sacrificed the religious to the literary interest in making his selections, and we doubt whether the book is really suited to the needs of the young.

Canon Glazebrook's volumes are designed for elder boys at a public school; they contain maps, illustrations, and many critical notes almost amounting to a commentary. The *School Edition of the Old Testament* will suit other teachers better, since it is little more than select passages, with the minimum of introductory and connecting notes. Both these books give the

text of the Revised Version, but Canon Glazebrook uses the Septuagint to a certain extent. Mr. Redlich also gives large portions of the Revised Version, but the purpose of his book is to show teachers how they are to teach the Bible stories. He protests vigorously against existing methods, and if, as he declares, there are many teachers who believe and teach that God was nearer to man in the Old Testament than in the New because to Abraham and others He appeared in visible form, then the protest is necessary. Mr. Redlich takes his task very seriously. He insists that God did not walk in the Garden of Eden, nor feel heat nor come down from heaven to see what He could not see there (p. 7). He says the sacrifice of Isaac should not be taught as a type of Christ—" did God the Father carry the fire and the knife ?" (p. 88). Teachers will find much of value in the book, though they must not accept its statements without criticism. A reference to " the earliest written version, written in 850 B.C.," conveys a very misleading impression. Our Lord is said to have quoted from the LXX. Also not to have accepted Old Testament stories—*e.g.*, that of Sodom and Gomorrah—as historically true, this is neither conservatism nor modernism, and its implications are serious.

Professor Robinson divides Genesis into three parts—" The Story of the Beginning of Things " as told in Southern Israel, Northern Israel, and by the Jewish priests—*i.e.*, J., E., and P. " Literary elegance," say the Editors, " has been sacrificed to clearness of expression and simplicity of language." Two examples will show what the sacrifice entails: " Jacob served seven years for Rachel; and they seemed unto him but a few days, for the love he had to her " becomes " He loved her so much that the time seemed very short to him "; and " (Joseph) sought where to weep; and he entered into his chamber, and wept there " becomes " He betook himself to an inner room, where he gave vent to his emotions." We grant that literary elegance has been sacrificed, but where is the compensating gain ? If Genesis is primarily a book of folk-lore, then it is well that the various strata should be disclosed. But if it is a great religious book as well as an artistic masterpiece in the form in which it left the final editors' hands, then to treat it like this is sacrilege. You might as well split up a historical play of Shakespeare into the parts derived from chronicles and his own additions. Granted that the work was worth doing, it is done with consummate skill; and students will be grateful for it. But the working men and women mentioned in the Preface are not so stupid that they cannot understand the exquisite prose of the English versions. And it would be a tragedy if this volume fell into the hands of children

after what the Report on Teaching English has said about the value of the Bible.

Why should we teach the Old Testament at all? we may ask in conclusion. Surely because it is the book of the Church. Apart from its religious value as a sacred book to-day, it has little claim to an important place in the school curriculum. But as a book of the Church it means what it has come to mean during all these Christian centuries. The Church finds Christ in the Old Testament, and will continue to find Him there in spite of all criticism. Mr. Redlich says we must not use Isaac as a type of Christ. But the Good Friday Morning Lesson is Genesis xxii., and preachers, Sunday-school teachers, and humble believers on their knees will always find Christ in this chapter. By all means let the day schools teach literary criticism with the help of the Old Testament, if they think it worth while, but this is not religious knowledge. The Bible, not the hypothetical documents upon which it is based, is our sacred book. Why should any child be troubled with J., E., and P. in a religious lesson? Mr. Redlich's description of the modern child as familiar with the results of the excavation of Jericho and the Einstein theory of relativity strikes us as farcical. Will not someone who accepts the critical position but sees its religious inadequacy write a book showing how to teach the Old Testament as the book of the Church?

W. K. L. Clarke.

Harmonism and Conscious Evolution. By Sir Charles Walston. London. 1922. John Murray. 21s. net.

Readers of *Aristodemocracy* will need no introduction to Sir Charles Walston as a keen-sighted guide in the many ethical and political problems raised by the War. He told us then that his attempted reconstruction of civilized morals was in the nature of prolegomena, the ethical and political part of a general philosophical system to which he has given the title "Harmonism." In this present volume we have the author's system as a whole. He now offers it to us as a complete and, as he thinks, convincing theory of life and mind, the matured results of many years' thought and experience, during which the main lines of the philosophy of Harmonism have gradually shaped themselves in his own mind and have been worked out in lectures and writings from time to time.

Sir Charles has felt that the present time and its needs rendered an early publication of the whole system of the Harmonistic philosophy in its unity and continuity a matter of urgency, and he has written this work with something of the feeling

of the prophet, conscious of a vocation in a time of need, and charged with a message and a gospel. So he introduces himself to us in the Preface, as offering for our acceptance a philosophy in which he himself wholeheartedly believes, and the benefit of which he himself has experienced. Hence the missionary motive to convey to others what he has found so helpful to himself.

"There exists," he tells us, "a still more personal motive for the publication of this book at the present moment and in its present form. During all these years, while constantly made aware by many among those with whom I came into intimate contact that they were struggling under the serious disadvantage of not possessing a complete and convincing theory of life and mind which could ultimately direct them in thought and action, and give to them the inestimable blessing of peace of mind and freedom from distressing doubt, on the other hand I found in myself that this philosophy of Harmonism freed me from such disconcerting and depressing doubt, and enabled me to think and act with peace and directness, and with the underlying confidence of complete reconciliation and harmony between the immediate and ultimate aims of life and thought. The Real and the Ideal, the Practical and the Theoretical, the Useful and the Good, Truth and Beauty, self-interests and the claims of others, our actual life and the life of religious aspiration, were not severed in irreconcilable conflict, but were harmonized into peaceful unity, full of vitality and hope."

The modesty of the claims made for this new philosophy predispose us to approach the study of it with high expectations. We are further encouraged by our author's assurance that so far as possible all technicalities and technical terms have been avoided, and that he hopes that what he has written may "prove to be intelligible to all those general readers who, without being specialists in philosophy, are interested in the problems of life and thought, and are conversant with our ordinary English language."

What, then, is this new philosophy which is to change our outlook upon modern life and thought, reform our ethics, be a guide in the solution of our economic and political problems, steady us in our international relationships, and reform our religion?

Sir Charles entitles it "Harmonism," and divides his work into two Parts, the First Part dealing with the origin of the Harmonistic and æsthetic instinct, the Second Part seeking to establish the fundamental effectiveness of the Harmonistic Principle and of Conscious Evolution in Epistemology, Æsthetics, Pragmatics, Ethics, Politics, and Religion.

Our author thus bids us look to Æsthetics for a new key to the search after Reality. We are given an analysis of the

æsthetic instinct and faculty. An attempt is made to trace its origin in the earliest beginnings and elements in human and even in animal life and throughout nature. The word "æsthetic" is used in a very wide sense, and Sir Charles is emphatic in his contention that Æsthetics does not deal exclusively or even primarily with man's "works of art." He wishes to establish the thesis that the æsthetic principle and instinct really is a new view-point of nature, life, and the works, actions, and thoughts of man, a fundamental response to an instinct, as well as to all perception, cognition, imagination, reasoning, and action. This principle of sentience and consciousness, he contends, is fundamental. It underlies all other principles of Epistemology, Pragmatics, Ethics, Politics, and Religion.

We must leave to the philosophical specialists any detailed criticism of the Harmonistic Principle, which we fear will fare badly at the hands of those who abhor metaphors, demand an exact and precise meaning of the content of words, and insist upon a rigid adherence to uniformity of meaning for terms used in any philosophical system.

The value of the book probably will be found to lie not in the success with which the author establishes his Harmonistic Principle, as the key to a true solution of our life and its needs over so wide a field of human activity, but in the sidelights he throws upon many topics in the course of his attempted practical application of his theory. He has many suggestive remarks to make—for example, on the problem of Education (Chapter VII.)—and what he says about the function of our educational institutions on p. 112 is worth noting.

In a valuable chapter on Ethics he attempts to drive home the lessons so ably impressed upon readers of his former thought-provoking volume, *Aristodemocracy*, and pleads for a clear and distinct codification of the moral consciousness of civilized man arising out of the clear and unbiassed study of the actual problems of life.

The outstanding chapter, however, of the book is that on Æsthetics (Part II., chapter ii., pp. 123-270). Here Sir Charles is thoroughly at home in a field of research peculiarly his own, and speaks to us with all the authority of an expert on Art and Archæology.

The application of the Harmonistic Principle to Religion in Chapter VI. is interesting, if not convincing. It will, no doubt, be reassuring to the religious man to learn that "the principle of conscious evolution, moved and directed by the harmoniotropic and aristotropic forces of the human mind, leads us ultimately towards the conception of an Ideal Life and an Ideal Universe."

H. M. Relton.

NOTICES

THE CANON LAW OF CHURCH INSTITUTIONS. By the Rev. O. J. Reichel. S.P.C.K., 1922. Vol. I. Price 10s. 6d.

The author of this book is well known for his *Manual of Canon Law* and similar works. In the present volume he gives us, in a form not easily obtainable elsewhere, a closely-packed collection of facts with regard to the growth of Roman Canon Law—he touches on Eastern Canon Law very lightly—and gives his authorities in a series of very full notes. He mentions the various synods which passed canons, and describes how these were systematically collected and commented on by canonists. The subject is one of considerable importance, and the facts here gathered will be of great use to the student. A second volume is promised, we suppose to deal with the contents of the canons. While this first volume is excellent as presenting facts, the opinions expressed will not be universally approved, especially those of the first two chapters, and those of the eighth chapter, which deals with the authority of the Canon Law.

There are two separate questions: (*a*) How far Roman Canon Law was accepted in England before the Reformation, a point on which the experts differ greatly; (*b*) how far it is now binding on the Church of England. Canon Law differs from Civil Law (especially modern Civil Law) in many particulars. For example, it does not necessarily require for abrogation the enactment of an authority equal to that which originally enforced it, and desuetude plays a much more important part in it than in Civil Law. There is, indeed, some ambiguity about "desuetude," and some writers (not our author) minimize this so as to make it almost non-existent in practice. Yet it is undoubted that some canons of even Œcumenical Councils became, even in a short period, obsolete. Otherwise we should be obliged to refrain from kneeling on Sundays and at Eastertide, and it would be impossible to translate bishops from one See to another. But the medieval Canon Law has a not inconsiderable influence on England to-day, as resulting in the existence of the customary, as opposed to the written, law of the Church, on which so much of our ecclesiastical life depends, and to which appeals can be made in suits affecting the Church. On the subject of the authority of Canon Law it is curious that no reference is made in this book to the late Bishop Collins's masterly essay on *The Nature and Force of the Canon Law* (Church Historical Society, XXXIV.).

It is not at all obvious why the author has prefixed to his work two chapters on the origins of the Church and its ministry. The thirty-five pages are quite insufficient to treat so large a subject, and it is remarkable that in the chapter on the ministry no reference is made to the vexed question whether the episcopate grew out of the presbyterate or is a development of the apostolate. These chapters contain some dubious statements, as when the author translates Gal. i. 18 so as to make St. Paul go to Jerusalem "to obtain direction from St. Peter" (p. 5). It is quite true, as Harnack says, that "Protestant historians are inclined to underrate the position of Peter among the Apostles"; but our author exaggerates that position, and more than once says that presidents of councils acted always as "holding the place" of that Apostle.

It may be hoped that the next volume will contain a full Index of names, which would add much to the usefulness of the work.

A. J. MACLEAN (*Bishop of Moray, etc.*).

LECTURES ON PREACHING AND SERMON CONSTRUCTION. By Paul Bull, M.A., C.R. S.P.C.K. Price 8s. 6d.

This volume consists of lectures given by the author to the students of Lichfield Theological College. The object of the book is to help the young parish priest in facing the most difficult part of his ministry—namely, the actual construction of a sermon. This difficulty is caused by the fact that the few rules which govern the technique of this art have usually not been taught to him in any part of his training. The author surveys the whole function of preaching from the head to the heart, from gesture to the fitting word. The defects of the book are a certain overloading of material, and perhaps some errors in the perspective of the subject.

There is no graver symptom in the Church of England than the belittling of preaching. The popular opinion among many of the clergy at present is that the exaltation of preaching shows a wrong perspective, and that the whole attention of the congregation ought to be fixed on worship and the sacraments. But people of wider experience know that this current fallacy among certain circles in this country is merely a provincialism. Those of us who are acquainted with the work of the famous French Bishop, Monsignor Dupanloup of Orleans, know how thoroughly and essentially "Protestant" he was in his estimate of preaching; how he exalted this office of the priest almost to a sacramental dignity; how he insisted that the curé of each parish should prepare beforehand a syllabus of a four years' course; how he insisted also that this message should be given in a "living" way, and not neutralized by technical faults, which it is the duty of every priest to avoid by suitable study and instruction.

Most preachers write their sermons seated on their study chair. But if every priest wrote his sermon on his knees, and so made his sermon a prayer, a profound revolution would have been accomplished in the whole national life. A living message would pour from every pulpit, and the era of vague generalities would be numbered with other obsolete abuses of the past. The *Ministerium Verbi* would have become a ministry of life and moral action, and the exile's prophecy which he puts into the mouth of God would fulfil itself, *Verbum meum non revertetur ad me vacuum, sed prosperabitur.*

The author of this book recognizes this principle by making the sanctified life of the preacher the basis of his function. Entire consecration, personal sincerity, and consistency of life are needed as a necessary preface to the intellectual preparation of a particular discourse. Without the ideal of personal sanctification the preacher's notes may ring false, because they are artificial. Spontaneous sincerity, and not mere conventionality, is the hall-mark of Christian preaching.

As to construction, the great aim of rules is to deliver the preacher from aimlessness. So often the preacher has no definite purpose in speaking at all, except just somehow to fulfil a distasteful duty for which he has neglected to prepare himself. "Many a wandering discourse one hears, in which the preacher aims at nothing and hits it."

A sermon ought to be strung on a logical skeleton. By so doing, a chain of reasoning, all tending to establish one important truth, is established, and the attention of the audience successfully held.

The art of delivery, perhaps, is not enough accented in the book, for perfect enunciation means a full church. The utmost devotion and the

finest intellectual treatment of a subject are perfectly useless if the congregation cannot hear, or cannot hear without strained attention. Perfect enunciation is not wanted in ordinary conversation. It might seem pedantic and eccentric, but it is a prime necessity in any but the smallest churches. It is sad to see a priest slaving away in the pulpit for half a lifetime to empty pews, when a little training in the secrets of audibility might have increased his influence a hundredfold. The secret of articulation, of the pause, the varieties of pitch and pace, form part of the elements of public speaking, which, if neglected, are as ruinous to persuasion as a slovenly chord or scale would be to the public performer at a concert. Technical training in the art of preaching ought to be one of the principal subjects in all theological colleges; and the test of candidates in it, both practical and theoretical, the stiffest in the Bishops' examination. Young men of great natural abilities in language and speaking can look after themselves. Talent will out. But it is the average priest who ought to be the subject of profound solicitude to Bishops' chaplains. If the average priest were trained in the elements of audibility, a great change for the better would take place in the Anglican services of the next generation.

J. PLOWDEN-WARDLAW.

ST. BERNARD, CONCERNING GRACE AND FREEWILL. Translated, with an Introduction, Synopsis and Notes, by Watkin W. Williams, M.A. S.P.C.K. 1920. Pp. xxiii.+95. 7s. 6d. net.

De tous les livres que les moines doivent ou peuvent lire, il n'y en a point, après les livres sacrez, qui leur puissent estre plus utiles, ou qui leur doivent estre plus familiers, que les œuvres de S. Bernard. . . . Ils trouveront dans cette lecture tout ce qu'ils peuvent chercher ailleurs, la solidité, l'agrément, la diversité, la justesse, la briéveté, le feu, les mouvements. . . . So Mabillon (*Etudes mon.*, II. iii.), and his advice may be extended to all religious. Hence the warm welcome due to this book: it presents in English one of St. Bernard's most instructive treatises, and provides material not only for the clear understanding of his mind and teaching, but also for the setting of this teaching in its proper place in the development of dogma.

The treatise was written before 1128 in reply to the question propounded by one of Bernard's auditors: "If God is the author of all the good you do, how can you hope for a reward?" St. Bernard's discussion of the relation between Grace and Freewill is the reply to this, given with all his usual charm and clearness. Mr. Williams neatly and rightly describes it (p. viii) as "less scholastic . . . than St. Anselm, more general in its outlook, more modern than St. Augustine's treatises on the same subject," but with "the fragrance of mystical theology" about it.

The translation is very readable and yet close to the original; the Introduction concisely sets forth the occasion of its writing, and discusses its merits and its place in the history of theology; while the Synopsis provides a careful digest of the argument—a most useful addition. The Notes will probably be found the most valuable part of the book, containing the fruit of wide reading and much thought. St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas justly occupy a large space. The only objection to these learned notes is that their copious quotations, Greek, Latin, and French, are perhaps hardly within the scope of those readers who require

translations. With greater attention to the language and style of St. Bernard they would make an excellent commentary for a critical edition of the Latin text, such as we hope Mr. Williams will give us. There are two useful Indexes, of Subjects and of Authors, to which a Scripture Index would have made a welcome addition.

J. H. BAXTER.

STUDIES IN HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, B.D. Student Christian Movement. 4s. net.

Mr. Rawlinson writes convincingly and in the style of an accomplished scholar. He expects to find the ultimate form of Christianity in a Liberal Evangelical Catholicism as opposed to "any form of attenuated Protestantism." Catholicism he defines as historical Christianity, unlimited by any kind of sectionalism and as built upon the contention that the recovery of man is not within his own power. The Christian Faith must remain Evangelical for the sake of maintaining its own essence, and Liberal for the sake of soundness of mind and of honesty and truth.

In Church government Mr. Rawlinson asserts his belief that on basis of the episcopate the problem of union will eventually be solved. To those who contend that episcopacy is only of the *bene esse* of the Church, he replies: "No Christian is going to be content with the ideal of a Church reunited on any lines short of the best."

Every chapter of the book is filled with solid reasoning, expressed in the most reverent spirit. On the question of New Testament criticism, Mr. Rawlinson points out that the literature of the New Testament is at the most that of the beginning of a missionary Church which grows subsequently in organization under conditions to be learnt from Church history. Amid the lapses from the mind of Christ and the countless efforts for reform perpetually renewed through the generations, the Holy Spirit has never deserted the Church, and is to those who will submit their wills to His divine guidance as truly operative to-day as in any other period of Church history.

The concluding chapter combats with much force the contention that Christianity spread through Europe as a "Mystery Religion." Gnosticism, but not historical Christianity, borrowed something from mystery religions. The pagan mystery-gods are all originally mythical personifications of the life of nature. The Christian "mystery" is an interpretation of the religious significance of an historical Person.

The Church saw in the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth a great act of God for man's salvation, and there are good reasons for thinking the Church was right.

HENRY LOWTHER CLARKE, *Bishop.*

Our Faith in God through Jesus Christ. By J. E. Davey. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

This is an excellent piece of apologetic, showing that faith in God is reasonable, necessary, effective and final. It consists of lectures delivered in Belfast, and the references to the sorrows endured by that city add to the reader's interest.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER